



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,603	10/19/1999	NAOYASU MIYAGAWA	JEL.28567RE-	3028

7590

07/18/2002

James E Ledbetter Esq
Stevens Davis Miller & Mosher LLP
P O Box 34387
1615 L Street NW, Suite 850
Washington, DC 20043-4387

EXAMINER

HINDI, NABIL Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2653

19 + 10 + 11

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/420,603

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

19

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Krista Zele, SPRE (3)

(2) Jim Ledbetter, atty (4)

Date of Interview 6-12-02, 6-28-02, 7-8-02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: not specific.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

On 6-12-02, it was discussed that review of 6 related reissues found issues of obvious double patenting amongst several of the related files. Mr. Ledbetter offered to file t.d.s in all 6 related files to overcome issues of double patenting. Discussions on 6-28-02 & 7-8-02 were focused on tracking the t.d.s and confirming they had been located, matched to the files and processed.

A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

It was also discussed that reviews of all files for recapture would be completed shortly.

KRISTA ZELE
SPECIAL PROGRAM EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2FC



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/420,603

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

20

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Krista Zele, SPRE (3) _____
(2) Jim Ledbetter, atty (4) _____

Date of Interview 7-16-02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The atty was informed that review of recaptures issues in the 6 related reissues has been completed and that the cases will be discussed with the exmr & his spe next week. In regard to recent Pannu v. Storz Instr. recapture rejections in all 06 related files are deemed appropriate and will be forthcoming.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Attly was given cites for Pannu v. Storz Instr.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Krista Zele

KRISTA ZELE
SPECIAL PROGRAM EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600